

## **Dela Cruz, Jeff**

---

**From:** R Kelley <rkelley@halcyon.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 13, 2017 9:02 PM  
**To:** PRC  
**Subject:** 11340 23rd Ave. NE, Project #3028516.  
**Attachments:** Rebecca Kelley Comment #3.docx

Attached and imbedded comment:

Comments from Rebecca Kelley; 2327 NE 115th St.; Seattle, WA 98125

I am responding to the Notice of Application for the division of (allegedly) 5 parcels into 6 on the property at 11340 23rd Ave. NE, Project #3028516.

This is my third comment.

Please also explain why, of the two large parcels comprising Project # 3028516 (11340 23rd Ave NE):  
8901001615 is currently owned by RAR 36 LLC  
And  
8901001620 is currently owned by FALK CLAUDE B (the original owner).

Is the financial statement by Bruce Wallace applicable to BOTH parcels, or only one? Is the re-plat request applicable to BOTH parcels, or only one? Why is this re-plat request even being considered?

Add this to my previous question regarding the subdivision of 1990, submitted under Comment #2 by Rebecca Kelley:

*I have questions about the original subdivision executed by Claude B Falk and approved on March 30, 1990, Project # 8806961. At the time, notices were supposed to be posted in the neighborhood and nearby homeowners notified. That did not happen. In fact, my neighbors and I found out about the subdivision years after the fact, far too late to offer comment.*

*Subsequently, I tried to find the configuration of the newly created parcels. I finally found them on a DPD Parcel map. But they never showed up on the King County Assessors site. Claude and Shirley Falk paid taxes on 2 large parcels (Parcel 8901001620 and Parcel 8901001615), not on 5 parcels.*

*Since utilities were never brought to the subdivided lots, I wondered if the subdivision was null and void. However, in the paperwork submitted for Project #3028516, I see they are alive and well. Why the discrepancy? If the subdivision was not registered with the Assessors' office, how can they possibly have legal recognition?*

*I offer this background to say the original subdivision did not follow City code/process; the existence of the subdivision was never registered with the King County taxing authority. There is good reason to challenge the validity of the original property division into 5 parcels.*

Comments from Rebecca Kelley; 2327 NE 115th St.; Seattle, WA 98125

I am responding to the Notice of Application for the division of (allegedly) 5 parcels into 6 on the property at 11340 23rd Ave. NE, **Project #3028516**.

This is my third comment.

Please also explain why, of the two large parcels comprising Project # 3028516 (11340 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE): 8901001615 is currently owned by RAR 36 LLC

And

8901001620 is currently owned by FALK CLAUDE B (the original owner).

Is the financial statement by Bruce Wallace applicable to BOTH parcels, or only one? Is the re-plat request applicable to BOTH parcels, or only one? Why is this re-plat request even being considered?

Add this to my previous question regarding the subdivision of 1990, submitted under comment #2 by Rebecca Kelley:

*I have questions about the original subdivision executed by Claude B Falk and approved on March 30, 1990, Project # 8806961. At the time, notices were supposed to be posted in the neighborhood and nearby homeowners notified. That did not happen. In fact, my neighbors and I found out about the subdivision years after the fact, far too late to offer comment.*

*Subsequently, I tried to find the configuration of the newly created parcels. I finally found them on a DPD Parcel map. But they never showed up on the King County Assessors site. Claude and Shirley Falk paid taxes on 2 large parcels (Parcel 8901001620 and Parcel 8901001615), not on 5 parcels.*

*Since utilities were never brought to the subdivided lots, I wondered if the subdivision was null and void. However, in the paperwork submitted for Project #3028516, I see they are alive and well. Why the discrepancy? If the subdivision was not registered with the Assessors' office, how can they possibly have legal recognition?*

*I offer this background to say the original subdivision did not follow City code/process; the existence of the subdivision was never registered with the King County taxing authority. There is good reason to challenge the validity of the original property division into 5 parcels.*